SOME ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON THE LATE BOOK Of the REVEREND DEAN of St. PAULS.

6
E. 11. 1
BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

By a Conformable Clergy-Man.

Let your moderation be known unto all men, the Lord is at hand, Phil. 4. 4.

But if you bite and devour each other, take heed that ye be not consumed of one another, Gal. 5. 15.

LONDON:

Printed for *Nathaniel Ranew*, at the *Kings Arms* in St. *Pauls-Church-Yard*. 1681.

SOME

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

ON THE LATE

BOOK

OF the REVEREND

DEAN of ST PAUL'S.

By a Conformable Clergy-Man.

Let your moderation be known unto all men, the Lord is at hand. Phil. 4.

But if you bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed of one another, Gal. 5. 15.

922.90

LONDON:

Printed for Richard Royston, at the Kings Arms in St. Paul's-Church-Yard. 1681.

Some Additional Remarques on the late Book of the Reverend Dean of ST. PAULS, *&c.*

SIR!

I Have read the *Reflections* on the *Preface* to Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s late Book. You have impoſed another task on me, and that is, to make ſome Remarques alſo on the *Book* it ſelf.

The Learned Doctor had ſaid in his Sermon, that he dared to ſay, *That if moſt of the Preachers at this day in the ſeparate Congregations, were ſoberly asked their judgments, Whether it were lawful for the people to join with them in the publick Aſſemblies, they would not deny it.* This Mr. *Alſop* ſays he believes they would flatly deny, and ſpeaks it with confidence. To which the Dr. replies.

I think no man doubts of his confidence that ever looked into his book: but in this matter he is ſo brisk, that he ſaith, he doth not queſtion that he ſhould carry it by the poll; and is withall ſo indiſcreet, as on this occaſion to triumph in the poll of Nonconformiſts *at* Guildhall, *as though all that gave their votes there, had owned theſe principles of ſeparation; for which many of thoſe Gentlemen will give him little thanks; and is a very unreaſonable boaſting of their numbers.* Page 107.

This I think is one of the wildeſt concluſions that ever was inferred from any aſſertion. The Dr. had ſaid, that he dared to affirm, that moſt *Nonconformiſt* Miniſters would acknowledg (if they were asked) the lawfulneſs of peoples joining in publick Aſſemblies. Mr. *A.* is of another opinion, and believes they (*i. e.* the Nonconform-

 ing

ing Miniſters) would flatly deny it; and ſays he, *Let theſe men be brought to the poll, I queſtion not they will carry it; and I ſuppoſe that though the Dr. preached in the Chappel, he never took the poll of the Nonconformiſts* (*i.e.* the Preachers, in *Guildhall*) The meaning of all which is plainly no more but this: Mr. *A.* believes that more of the Nonconforming Miniſters would deny, than affirm the lawfulneſs of joining in Parochial Churches; and that if they were numbred, thoſe that are for the negative would carry it. And to rebate the Drs. confidence of the affirmative, he adds, that tho' he preached in the Chappel, yet he never took the poll of the *Nonconformiſts* in the Hall, and therefore may be out and miſtaken concerning them.

How can the Dr. infer from hence, that Mr. *A.* doth indiſcreetly triumph in the number of *Noncon*'s in general, when he ſpake only of their Preachers? How can he infer that Mr. *A.* would ſuggeſt that all that gave their votes there, did own the principles of ſeparation, when he ſpake not one word concerning them? Some men may want perſons to libel and expoſe; but at this rate 'twill be hard to want pretences and occaſions for it; and the Dr. deſerves as little thanks for traducing Mr. *A.* as *he* would have deſerved if he had reported the Gentlemen that gave their Votes at *Guildhall*, as friends to the principles of ſeparation.

P. 114. The Dr. having diſcourſed the inconvenience of Separation upon a conceit of purer adminiſtrations, and leſs defective ways of worſhip; and repreſented the ignorance, pride, injudiciouſneſs, and conceitedneſs of the ordinary ſort of zealous profeſſors, and the ungovernable and factious humor of that ſort of people, and the pernicious conſequence of complying with them in the words of Mr. *B.* he enquires, *And muſt the reins be laid on their necks, that they may run whither they pleaſe, becauſe forſooth they know what is good for their ſouls better than the King doth; and they love their ſouls better than the King doth; and the King cannot bind them to hurt, famiſh, or endanger their ſouls?*

To the Drs. queſtion I ſhall reply, by asking another: Muſt the people be tied neck and heels together, becauſe they are proud, ignorant, and injudicious, or becauſe they are inclinable to faction, and ungovernable? Is there no medium betwixt laying the reins upon the *neck*, and tying *that* and their heels together? Betwixt permitting them a boundleſs liberty, and giving them none at all? Surely methinks 'twere not difficult to ſee an intermediate ſpace between extremes ſo vaſtly diſtant from each other.

And

And let me add, Do not the people know what Preaching and Preachers do them moſt good? what convinces their judgments, bows their wills, enlivens their affections, and creates upon their ſouls the cleareſt and moſt paſſionate reſolutions for the ſervice of God and their own ſalvation? If they do not know theſe things, they are not men, but brutes. Do not men know which meat and drink doth beſt ſtrengthen and nouriſh, and is leaſt offenſive to their ſtomacks and digeſtive faculties? This I think will be granted: and may they not know what ſort of preaching doth beſt edifie and build them in ſpiritual ſtrength and ſtature? And is it any diſhonour to the King, that the people know theſe things better than he does? Or doth that perſon lay blame upon the King, that ſhould affirm it? And yet this is that which the Doctor ſeems to inſinuate, for he enquires, *Why muſt the King bear all the blame, if mens ſouls be not provided for according to their wiſhes? that is, if they have not ſuch preaching and preachers as they would have.*

But though the King be not to be blamed, that mens ſouls be no better provided for, there be men in the world that are to be blamed for it, and who they are, let the Doctor conjecture. There are Preachers in this Church that have the *cure of Souls*, to whom an honeſt Country Farmer would ſcarce commit the *care of his Cows*. 'Tis an expreſſion of *Cauſinus*. And who gave theſe perſons admiſſion into the ſacred Office, every one knows.

But the Dr. proceeds, *Doth the King do any thing in this matter, but according to the eſtabliſhed Law and Orders of this Church? why did he not keep to the good old Phraſe of King and Parliament?*

This is raking into old ſores, and looks like a malicious inſinuation, and a deſign of repreſenting Mr. B. as il-loyal, which to ſpeak ſoftly, becomes not the charity and candor of the Doctor. But what if he had kept that good old Phraſe, as he pleaſes to call it, he had done no more than the Doctor himſelf doth in ſenſe, in the lines preceeding, for he ſays, the King *doth nothing but by eſtabliſhed Laws*, and Laws are the Acts of King and Parliament.

But the Doctor goes on, *And why did he (i. e. Mr. B.) not put it as it ought to have been, that they know what makes for their own edification, better than the wiſdom of the whole Nation, aſſembled in Parliament* (i. e. according to the good old Phraſe, the King and Parliament,) *and the Governours of this Church.*

This argument were good, if the wiſdom of the Nation were infallible, or it were impoſſible they could be miſtaken; but till that be

be proved, I feel not the weight of it. 'Tis the Popiſh argument, the Doctor knows, and was preſſed againſt the Reformation by the *Romaniſts*. I venerate authority, and am not willing to ſuſpect the wiſdom of it; but I muſt openly profeſs, than I am much more moved by the proofs that they make of the wiſdom of their Determitions, than by their bare Authoritative Aſſertions. I value the ancient Fathers and Councils, but 'tis not for what they *ſay*, but for what they *prove*: And the like I do ſay of more modern Determinations; and he is a ſtranger in *Hiſtory* as well as *Experience*, that doth not obſerve, that many Laws and Conſtitutions are more the effects of Intereſt, Pride, Paſſion, and Revenge, than of Wiſdom, Juſtice and Righteouſneſs. The Determinations and Conſtitutions of the Council of *Trent*, are a ſufficient proof hereof, and I wiſh the ſame might not be too truly ſaid of ſome of the more ancient and venarable Councils, yea, and of ſome Laws that are of much later date than the lateſt of them.

Pag. the 119*th* the Doctor quotes theſe words of Mr. *B.* in his Anſwer to his Sermon, *How oft have I told you* (ſaith Mr. *B.*) *that I diſtinguiſh and take thoſe for true Churches that have true Paſtors; but I take thoſe for no true Churches that have* (1.) *Men uncapable of the Paſtoral Office.* (2.) *Or not truly called.* (3.) *Or that deny themſelves to have the power eſſential to a Paſtor.* "For (ſays the Dr.) "one or other of theſe, he thinks moſt, if not all the Parochial "Churches in *England*, fall under, and conſequently that the peo- "ple may ſeparate from them. That Mr. *B.* doth think ſo, he endeavours to prove, becauſe if the people judg their Miniſters unworthy or incompetent, he allows them liberty to withdraw and ſeparate.

'Tis a hard caſe, if people that have an ignorant, drunken, and malignant, ſapleſs Teacher, may not go to the next Congregation, yea or to a *Nonconformiſt* that is a man of better abilities, and a better converſation, without being reputed Schiſmaticks; and methinks no man of piety, and that knows how much mens graces and virtues are actuated by ſerious, lively, and vigorous preaching, and how they languiſh and dwindle under that which is dry, trifling, lukewarm and unſerious ſhould doubt of it.

But ſaith the Dr. p. 12. "God (ſaith Mr. *B.*) in nature and "Scripture hath given the people that conſenting power, antece- "dent to the Prince's, which none can take from them.

Ican.

I cannot tell how to believe that God hath given any Prince or Governour of Churches a greater power over their people than Parents have over their children in the choice of Employments, or diſpoſals in Marriage. A Father may propoſe an Employment or Match to his Son or Daughter, but he may not impoſe them againſt their own conſent, as is generally acknowledged. Again, if in ſuch caſes they chuſe amiſs, and to their apparent danger, they may forbid them; and thus much Magiſtrates may and ought to do; but whether they may impoſe againſt the conſent of the people, ſeems to me not ſo clear as ſome men imagine. And this is all that Mr. *B.* deſires, which might be granted, and the right of Patrons preſerved too, for ought that I can ſee.

But the Dr. adds, *ibid.* "Mr. *B.* makes the people judg of the "worthineſs and competency of their Miniſters, in caſe incompe-"tent Miniſters be ſet over the people, though it be half the Pa-"riſhes in a Kingdom, or only the tenth part, it is no Schiſm, ſaith "he, but a duty, for thoſe that are deſtitute, to chuſe thoſe that "they judg moſt competent; and 'tis a duty for faithful Miniſters, "though forbidden by Superiors, to perform their Office to ſuch "people that deſire it.

Let me beg leave to ask the Reverend Dr. whether there can be ſuch a thing as an incompetent Paſtor ſet over a people? If he grants it, as ſure he cannot deny it, I would ask him again, what the people muſt do in ſuch a caſe? if he ſays, they muſt complain, and uſe regular ways for his removal; I would again enquire, what if they be poor, and not able to bear the charge of ſuch a proceeding? or if after all endeavours, they cannot remove him (and I will aſſure him, 'tis no eaſie matter to remove an incompetent Paſtor) what muſt they do? muſt they ſtarve at home, or be treated as Separatiſts, if they go abroad to hear a Diſſenter that Preaches in the Neighbourhood? If it be ſaid, that the people are no capable judges of a Miniſters abilities; and ſo the Dr. intimates in ſeveral places of his Book (page 123, 124. & *paſſim*). I anſwer, the Learned Dr. allows Separation, and thinks it duty too in certain caſes, *viz.* "1. In caſe of Idolatrous worſhip. 2. In caſe of "falſe Doctrine, impoſed inſtead of true. And 3. In caſe things "indifferent be made neceſſary to ſalvation, page 213. 214.

I deſire to learn from this worthy Dr. whether the people in theſe caſes are bound to ſeparate? or whether the obligation lies only on the Paſtors? if it lyes on both (and on both it muſt lie, or elſe the people

people are bound to be damned) then the people must judg; and if they may judg in these cases, I know not why they may not make a judgment of the competency of their Ministers. He is an incompetent Pastor that Preaches false Doctrine or Heresie, that commends and practises Idolatry, and makes things indifferent necessary to salvation; and in these the people may judg by the Doctors own confession; and if they may judg in these, they may judg in some other cases, for ought that I can perceive.

In the mean time I am not about to deny that the people, at least of them, are ignorant injudicious, and rash; and do many times censure and condemn the innocent and worthy. All that I design is to make it a little evident, that there is a mean betwixt the two extremes, and that should be enquired after. The people are neither the wisest among men, nor are they a herd of beasts. In some things they may and must judg, in others it may be denied them.

But the Dr. proceeds (p. 123.) and says, "Mr. *B.* bids the "people not think that he is persuading them to make no difference, "but after he hath set aside the utterly insufficient and heretical (of "which the people are admirable Judges) he lays down this gene"ral rule, Any one whose Ministry is such as tendeth more to de"struction than edification, is not to be owned, and consequently "to be separated from.

And in good earnest, is no difference to be made of Ministers? then farewell all lawful as well as unlawful Separation. The people are not Judges of Insufficiency or Heresie, and therefore must swallow all that they propound, and go along with their Pastors to the Devil; and though they preach more for the encouragement of sin and vice, than they do for godliness and virtue, yet the people must not separate from them. This, to speak modestly, is something crudely spoken, and not with that usual judgment and caution as the Dr. expresses (or should express) his sentiments.

"But the Dr. says, this is directly contrary to the principles of "the old *Nonconformists*, and even to Mr. *B.* himself: for as a Ca"suist (says he, p. 124.) he thus determines, 1. *That a Ministers personal faults do not allow people to separate from the Worship of God.* 2. *Nor all Ministerial faults, but only those that prove him or his Ministration utterly intollerable.*

Well, and where is the inconsistency of this determination with what the Dr. quoted from him in the page before? Did he there say that every personal or Ministerial fault would justifie Separation?

341

tion? I can find no such thing, he only mentions the utterly insufficient and heritical, such as do more hurt than good; and I think these are the same with such as prove Ministers, and their Ministration utterly intollerable. But by this, and many other passages in this Book, a man would be tempted to think, that some others write in haste, and without the advice of their friends, as well as Mr. *B.*

Page 130. The Dr. says, that Mr. *B.* makes Conformity it self a scandalous thing, and then tells the people over and over, "it is no "sin to separate from scandalous Priests, especially when the scan-"dal is notorious, as it is in this case. And *Page* 131. the Dr. adds, "He chargeth us with down-right Lying, and Perjury, and tells me "of Thirty tremendous aggravations of the sin of Conformity, "among which are Lying, and Perjury, and drawing on our selves "the guilt of many thousand Perjuries.

To this I answer in Mr. *B*'s own words of his first Plea in the Preface, *I write not this* (says he) *as accusing Conformists, or the Law-makers, but as answering their long and loud accusations and demands; and if telling what I fear, seem a telling what others are guilty of, it is a consequent which I cannot avoid.* In his second Plea, having asserted the moral impossibility of bringing all good Christians to believe Conformity lawful, he gives many reasons for it, and among others this, because Conformity looks like a horrid and frightful evil, being no less than deliberate Lying, and Perjury, and the justifying of thousands in it, and the publick renouncing endeavours of Reformation. And then he adds, *I am not saying, that all these, or any of them are such as they fear them to be, but only, that they fear them to be such,* pag. 173. And in his Answer to the Drs. Sermon, these are his words, *I have only told you how many, and heinous the sins are which we fear we should be guilty of, should we Conform,* pag. 52. Hence 'tis obvious enough by Mr. *B*'s. words, that he accuses not others, but vindicates himself and his brethren from the imputation of keeping up a Schism against their own consciences; and in that very Chapter, where he reckons up the several agravations of Perjury and Lying, he doth not determine, that the Conformable Clergy are guilty of them, but says, *If they be so, such are the aggravations of their sin.*

Now, I pray, let it be impartially considered, whether Mr *B.* hath not a difficult province to manage. If he gives no reason or

account of his own, and his brethrens Nonconformity, he and they are unconscionable Schismaticks; if he do give some reason for it, and account of it, then he is interpreted to accuse the Conformists, and repute them scandalous, and perswade the people to Separation, though he renounced all such accusations, as is obvious from his words before-mentioned.

Yet after all this I have said on the behalf of this reverend man, I must add (for I am my self a Conformist) that I am not of his opinion in the interpretation of the Subscriptions, and Declarations imposed on the Clergy. They are of ambiguous sense and meaning; for what the sense of the Law makers and Imposers is, who can be sure? I cannot tell; and if you enquire, some will utterly refuse to give any sense or meaning of them; others will expound them, some in one sense, and some in another. The case being thus, I do not think my self obliged to understand them in the worst sense that can be put upon them, but in a sense of favour: and such a sense (Mr. *B.* says) is by the most judicious Conformists put on them, that he and his brethren themselves would submit to them, if they could believe *that* were indeed the meaning of them. I am not satisfied as yet, that I am obliged to understand them in any other; which I speak in vindicatinn of my own and my brethrens Conformity, without reflection on those of other apprehensions, or justifying the Impositions. And upon this score there is a Paper Printed the last year *as an account of the* London *Sheriffs holding their Office*, Which, if any man doth honestly fear God, so as he *would* in good earnest Conform if he *could*, but *cannot* in point of scruple, I would commend to his perusal: who may perhaps see more to satisfy him in that one (but very *full*, and very *much considered*) single sheet, in regard to our present Conformity, than he hath found hitherto in other Books upon that Subject, though there be many which are, or which would make Volumes, that are written.

In Page 132. the Dr. charges Mr. *B.* with saying, that he overthrows all Religion, and sets up man in rebellion against God. To which I answer, all that Mr. *B.* intends in those words, is no more but thus, Such is the consequence of the Drs. Doctrine. Whether it be rightly inferred, let the Dr. and Mr. *B.* determine. But this I am sure of, that the Dr. infers many things from Mr. *B's.* Doctrine, which he detests and abhors, as truly as himself abhors the setting up man above God. Such are all *Principles inconsistent with Government*,

vernment; and all *Pleas* which lay the *foundation for diſorder and confuſion*, whatſoever he ſays, page 137. and 139.

The Dr. had ſaid in the *Preface* to his Sermon, "If it be lawful "to ſeparate on the pretence of greater purity, where there is an "agreement in Doctrine, and the ſubſtantial parts of Worſhip, as "is acknowledged in our caſe, then a bare difference of opinion, "as to ſome circumſtances of Worſhip, in the beſt Conſtitution "of Churches, will be ground ſufficient for Separation; and this, "conſidering the variety of mens fancies, is to make an infinite di-"viſibility in Churches. To which Mr. *A.* makes this reply, *That though ſome petty and inconſiderable inconveniencies, ſome litlte trouble, may ariſe to a Church from the levity and volubility of mens minds, yet this is no reaſon why they ſhould enſlave their judgments and conſciences to others.* So the Dr. quotes him, but he expreſſes himſelf more at large, and with words of greater weight, as may be ſeen in his *Preface*.

From theſe words of Mr. *A.* the Dr. takes occaſion to enquire, "what a rare advocate had this man been for the *Novatians*, *Dona-"tiſts*, *Luciferians*, or whatſoever Schiſmaticks rent the Church in "pieces in former times. And ſuppoſing St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Auſtin*, and other great oppoſers of the ancient Schiſms, to be met together: he gathers from theſe words, and the Principles of Separation, that he lays down elſewhere in his *Books*, how he would accoſt them. Page 19[illegible], Then forms an elegant Oration for him, ſuppoſing him haranguing it before them. Page 198, 199. And page 200. theſe expreſſions he puts in his mouth. "Why do you "*Auſtin* and *Cyprian*, and other Reverend Fathers, cry out ſo of-"ten of the Sacrilegiouſneſs of Schiſm? We know no other Sacri-"ledg, but the Sacrilegious deſertion of our Miniſtry in obedi-"ence to the Laws; this is a Sacriledg we often talk of, and tell "the people it is far worſe than robbing Church-plate, conſidering "what precious gifts we have.

Theſe laſt words are, I am afraid, a prophane jeer, and look more like words dropt from the pen of *Ben. Johnſon*, or *Fletcher*, than that of Dr. *St.* Has not God endued Mr. *B.* (for 'tis on him he reflects) and other *Nonconformiſts*, with *precious gifts* (for 'tis a Scripture-word, and I'le make bold to uſe it, though I be thought to cant)? and can the Dr. deny it? or doth it become his gravity to deride them? If he muſt uſe his Sarcaſtick faculty, I wiſh he would chuſe ſome common objects to employ it on, and not on

things that are ſacred and divine; for ſuch are the gifts wherewith Mr. *B.* and others of his Brethren are bleſſed of God; and I believe the Dr. in his conſcience can't deny it, however he takes liberty to deride them.

And when, I pray, and where did Mr. *B.* or any of his brethren ſay, they knew no Sacriledg but that of the Sacrilegious deſertion of their Miniſtry? Let this be proved, or elſe it muſt be reputed a defamation. But peradventure the Dr. will ſay, That when men play the Orator, they are not obliged to ſpeak exact truth; but where will he find any thing in Scripture to patronize it? He endeavours to juſtifie an ugly ſarcaſm that he made uſe of in his Sermon, by theſe words of our Saviour, *I came not to call the righteous, but ſinners to repentance*; but I am not very certain they will ſerve his purpoſe; for ſome men that the Dr. values, as well as ſome that he deſpiſes, give another interpretation of them, as he very well knows; but where he will find any to juſtifie this Catechreſtical ſcoff, I cannot tell: but may be he may *find*, or *make* one do it.

But why doth the Dr. add, *in obedience to the Laws?* Do all Laws oblige ſo far, as for Miniſters upon that account to deſert their Office? If ſo, then may not only the three children go to the fiery Furnace, and *Daniel* to the Lyons, but all Proteſtant Preachers to the flames, if they continue to exerciſe their Miniſtry againſt the prohibition of Popiſh Laws? If not, then 'tis not Laws, but the equity and juſtice of Laws, that lays an obligation on them; and that is the controverſie between him and his Nonconformable Brethren, in which I will not interpoſe. But this is not the only place where the weight of the Drs. Arguments is little for want of diſtinction, reſtriction, and limitation. And this is an infirmity and weakneſs of diſcourſe, that runs through a great part of his Book, and which renders it invalid to his Adverſaries, and eſpecially Mr. *B.*

But the Dr. enquires, *Whether it be not a ſin to break the Churches Communion?* p. 198. To which I anſwer, Yes doubtleſs, all unneceſſary Separation is a ſin, and ſuch I do eſteem much of the preſent Separation in *England.* But what then? Are all that are Schiſmatical, unworthy to live upon the earth? Muſt they be proſecuted by Laws to Impriſonment, Baniſhment, and Death? Is there no way of curing a wound in the arm or leg, but by amputation? Are not Drunkenneſs, Adultery, Lying, and Swearing, ſins? Yes ſurely, 'twill not be denied. But muſt all theſe Criminals be injured, proſcribed

bed, and ſent to the *Indies*? This would be thought unreaſonable. And why perſons of ſome Schiſmatical Principles (provided the main of their doctrine be ſound, and conſiſtent with Chriſtianity) may not have as much favour as drunkards and other immoral men, I know not.

But are there no other ways of reforming the Schiſmatical humors of men, but Gaols and Confiſcations, and other like Arguments? Are there no methods of reclaiming Schiſmaticks, but by Rods and Axes? Are not perſonal inſtructions and kindneſs more agreeable to the nature of the Paſtoral Office, and the ſpirit of our Saviour, whoſe ſervants we are, and whoſe work we are to do in the world? Methinks no man that hath read the New Teſtament, ſhould doubt of it; and I do confeſs that I hate theſe Military methods of converting Diſſenters, and I never ſaw any good come of them.

I live in a Town where there are ſome Diſſenters; I have always treated them with kindneſs, and have avoided to exaſperate them either in my publick or private diſcourſes; and by this means they will come ſometimes to hear me, and will grant me to be a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt; whereas had I railed at them, or proſecuted them at Law, or encouraged others to do it, they would never have come at me, but accounted me a Limb of Antichriſt, and a Factor or Agent for the Devil. And I muſt and do openly avow, that 'tis more eaſie to my mind to think, that when they are abſent from my Congregation, they are ſerving God elſewhere, than it would be to think they were ſome of them in priſons, their Families wanting bread, and others crying to God for vengeance on me as a perſecutor; and which is moſt eaſie to my mind *living*, I doubt not will be ſo *dying*. They are perſons of holy lives and upright converſations, at leaſt ſome of them; and I would not have a hand in perſecuting and undoing them, for all the Preferments this Church or this World affords.

Let me add thus much on the behalf of Mr. *A.* I do not believe that he either deſires or pleads for univerſal Toleration, or would defend all the ancient Schiſmaticks, or that he would open his mouth on the behalf of *Socinians*, *Arrians*, *Anti-Trinitarians*, *Quakers*, or other like Sectarian Infidels: all that he pleads for, is liberty for peaceable and Chriſtian Diſſenters; but I do think that the Reverend Dr. hath wrung from his words ſuch a ſenſe as he never intended, or did once enter into his thoughts.

Pag.

Pag. 273. The Dr. ſays, "I do not ſee but the objections made "againſt the Diſcipline of this Church, might be removed, if the "things allowed and required by the Rules thereof (that is, Confirmation of children by the Biſhop, when they are able to give an account of the neceſſary points of Chriſtian faith and practice, and Certificate be made thereof by the Miniſter of the Pariſh) "were "duly practiſed, and might attain to as great purity as is ever pre-"tended to by the ſeparate Congregations, who now find ſo much "fault for our want of diſcipline.

I wiſh with all my heart the Rules of the Church were reduced to practice, which I am ſure they never can nor will be, whilſt the Dioceſſes in *England* are of the preſent dimenſions. He that thinks any Biſhop can confirm all the children in his Dioceſs, doth but dream: were he never ſo deſirous of it, and diligent in it, 'twere impracticable; and the neglect and impracticableneſs of this thing, is one great reaſon of the ignorance and wickedneſs of our Pariſhes and Congregations; and thus 'tis like to be, till Dioceſſes be leſſened and the number of Biſhops encreaſed, and ſome effectual care taken that children be inſtructed and confirmed.

Page 275. The Dr. aſſerts a power in the Presbyters of this Church to reject and deny the holy Sacrament to the ſcandalouſly wicked, provided he give notice of it to the Ordinary within fourteen days; and for this produces the Rubrick before the Communion.

I grant what the Rubrick allows: but is not the Miniſter like to have a fine time of it, if he muſt be bound to inform and proſecute all at Law that are ſcandalous and unfit to come to the holy Table? The Dr. knows that all above the age of ſixteen are bound to take the Sacrament three times a year by the Orders of this Church; and in ſome great Pariſhes the number of the ſcandalous and wicked is ſo great, that if the Miniſter be bound to proſecute all whom he accounts himſelf obliged in conſcience to refuſe, the life of a Kennel-raker were more elegible than his; for he muſt ſpend his time in perpetual travel and attendance upon Courts, which is a very fine Employment for a man of piety and conſcience, and that deſires to ſpend his time in his ſtudy, and teaching and inſtructing the people committed to his care.

But the Dr. enquires *What, would you have every particular Paſtor have an unaccountable power? Or would you not have them bound to juſtifie what they do, and proſecute the perſon for thoſe faults for which*

which they exclude him from the Communion?

I anſwer, 1. I think it were not amiſs, if the excluded perſon were obliged to complain if he thought himſelf wronged, and the Miniſters were excuſed from doing the Office of an Apparitor; but this I inſiſt not on. Therefore I add, I plead not for an unaccountable power in particular Paſtors, but for ſuch a power as they may account for; which I am ſure they can never do for *this* in great pariſhes, and where the Dioceſſes are ſo large and wide; and there is no man that will give himſelf the liberty to think, can deny it. The number of the ſcandalous is ſo great, the diſtance from the Biſhops Court in many places ſo far, the tedioufneſs and corruption of the Officers ſo abominable, that it is a thing utterly impracticable. 'Tis impoſſible that any man can juſtifie himſelf in refuſing to proſecute according to Canon all the ſcandalous that he may juſtly reject. In brief, either to talk or think of exerciſing Diſcipline, or reforming this Church, till we have more Biſhops or Suffragans, and other things altered (which might be done if our Superiors pleaſed, without altering the Conſtitution) is to build Caſtles in the air, and to dream of Rocks to ſet them on, among the clouds of heaven.

Page 278. The Dr. quotes theſe words of Mr. *B. If a Miniſter doth publickly admoniſh a perſon by name, not cenſured by the Ordinary, the Lawyers tell him he may have his Action againſt him.* To which he replies: "What need this publick admonition? Doth "the nature of Church-diſcipline lye in that?

To which I anſwer: No man ever dreamt that the whole nature of Church-diſcipline conſiſted in publick admonition by name. There are ſeveral intermediate acts of Diſcipline; Publick admonition by name is not to be attempted till others have been eſſayed and tryed in vain. And this publick admonition (after the fruitleſs uſe of that which is private) is that which Mr. *B.* ſays cannot legally be performed by the Presbyters of this Church.

But the Dr. makes a ſecond Reply to thoſe words of Mr. *B.* "If a reſtraint be laid on Miniſters by Law, the queſtion then "comes to this, Whether the obligation to admoniſh publickly "an offender, or to deny him the Sacrament if he will come to it, "be ſo great, as to bear him out in the violation of a Law made "by publick Authority, with a deſign to preſerve our Religion?

To which I anſwer, I do not think that Miniſters are obliged to admoniſh publickly all offenders after the unſucceſsful tryal of private

vate means and endeavours, though no Law forbad it. Pearls are not to be caſt before Swine. If the perſon or perſons be ſuch as will miſchief, wound, or kill the Miniſter that ſhould ſo admoniſh him or them, I think he is not obliged to do it: but whether out of that caſe, and others of like nature, a Miniſter may not be obliged to do it, is another queſtion, yea, though the Law ſhould forbid it. And 'tis another queſtion, whether he be obliged to give ſuch a perſon the holy Sacrament, though the Law ſhould command it: Mans Laws are not valid againſt Gods. If God obliges Miniſters to publick admonition of ſcandalous and incorrigible offenders, and to refuſe them a participation in the holy myſteries of our Religion, no man can take off the obligation.

Page 281. The Dr. ſays, "The due exerciſe of diſcipline is a "work of ſo much prudence and difficulty, that the greateſt Zealots "for it have not thought it fit to be truſted in the hands of every "Parochial Miniſter, and his particular Congregation, and for this he quotes *Calvin* and *Beza*.

To which I anſwer: I believe there are very few Pariſh-prieſts in *England* that are ambitious of having the exerciſe of diſcipline committed to their care and conduct; and indeed very many of them have neither piety or prudence ſufficient for the management of it. But withall I muſt add, I ſhould be very ſorry (and ſome are very worthy of blame if it be ſo) if moſt Pariſh-Miniſters be not as capable of it as Chancellors, Commiſſaries, Officials, and Surrogates, who are the people that exerciſe what Diſcipline is exerciſed in this Church; and 'tis ſufficiently known, that many of them are perſons of none of the greateſt underſtandings, the beſt prudence, the tendereſt conſciences, or the ſevereſt lives, which yet are qualifications, hugely neceſſary in perſons that manage the Diſcipline of the Church.

In brief, I condemn not the prudence of the Church of *England*, in not committing the *exerciſe* of Diſcipline to every Pariſh-Miniſter; but then I would humbly move, that we might have Biſhops enough to do it. The Dr. appropriates to Biſhops, Government, Ordination, and Cenſures, and I am very well content they have them, provided they will, or can diſcharge them. But of the impoſſibility of that, I am paſt doubt; for though the Dioceſſes of our *Engliſh* Biſhops be not ſo great as that of the Pope (which the Dr. acknowledges to be too great and ſpacious) yet I think they are too large for their management, and that the duty incumbent

bent on them, with respect unto them, is utterly impracticable. *Mount Athos*, *Pelion*, or *Ossa*, are neither of them so great as the Globe of the earth, yet they are all burthens utterly insupportable.

Whether the Dr. will allow this multiplication of Bishops (or Suffragans rather, that the name Bishop may not become too common, and so become less venerable), I cannot tell. I find him in many places of his *Book*, and in his *Preface*, very jealous *of the honour of our Reformation*, and positively resolved, never to condemn the Constitution of this Church, nor the lawfulness of the Ceremonies hitherunto practised in it, *vide Pref.* p. 89.

I have my self a very great esteem for the Reformation of this Church, and a mighty honour for the great and incomparable *Heroes*, that were the Reformers of it; but 'tis no disparagement to say, they were but men (though the greatest men); nor is it any Reproach to the Reformation to say, it was imperfect. The Learned and Pious Dr. *Burnet* hath observed divers defects, and imperfections in it (and I know not how they can be denied); and to speak the truth concerning it, is not to reproach it. And what if it should be said, that among others 'twas an imperfection in our Reformation, that the number of Bishops was not increased so far, as that they might be sufficient for the work and duty incumbent on them? Can a Bishop inspect the Clergy in a Dioces of the present dimensions? can he exercise the Censures of the Church upon all the culpable delinquents in it? can he confirm all the Children in it? can he ordain Priests for all the Parishes therein, with that circumspection, wariness, and care, which was observed by the primitive Bishops, and which the honour of this Church, the Christian Religion, and the salvation of souls doth require? Doth the Reverend Dr. think those things can be done by any, the most diligent and industrious Bishop on earth? I dare say, he cannot think it possible; and if he doth not think it possible, I would enquire further of him, whether he does not think it very necessary and desirable, that all this work were put into more hands, that they may be capable of performing it? for till then, I am much assured it can never be done, however necessary or desirable it may be?

These things being said, I will now add, I shall never desire the Dr. to condemn the Constitution of this Church (nor will I believe many of the Nonconformists desire him to do it), but I would humbly desire him, to put to his helping hand, for the amendment and

perfecting of it; and to perfect and compleat it, is not to condemn it; 'tis only to confeſs it a little ſhort of that perfection that it may attain; and what great work is perfect of a ſudden, at its birth into the world? In brief, Dioceſan Epiſcopacy I like (and that's the Conſtitution of this Church), and ſo doth Mr. *B.* for ought that I can ſee: but I would fain have more Biſhops, not to *controul Epiſcopal Power*, but to aſſiſt in the performance of Epiſcopal Duty.

Page 301. The Dr. undertakes to confute what Mr. *B.* had ſaid, (*viz.*) that wherever there is the true notion of a Church, there muſt be a conſtitutive regent part (*i. e.* a ſtanding governing power) which is an eſſential part of it, and this he promiſes to do from Mr. *B.* himſelf.

How well he hath done it, let the Reader judg, by what the Author of the *Peaceable Deſign* hath replied to him upon this Subject. But the Dr. infers from what Mr. *B.* had ſaid of the neceſſity of a Regent Head to every Church, as followeth:

"And ſo Mr. *B*'s. Conſtitutive Regent part of a Church, hath done "the Pope a wonderful kindneſs, and made a very plauſible plea for "his univerſal Paſtorſhip. But there are ſome men in the world, who "do not attend to the advantages they give to Popery, ſo they may "vent their ſpleen againſt the Church of *England*.

To which I anſwer, Mr. *B*'s Conſtitutive Regent part of a Church, hath done the Pope no kindneſs at all; for another viſible Head may be aſſigned to the Catholick Church, and that is the holy Jeſus; he is both the viſible and inviſible Head thereof; he is unto it both a Head of government, and a Head of influence; he governs it by his Laws, and by the influence of his Spirit, and hath appointed inferiour officers for the government and direction of it, according to his own inſtitutions: and though he be not ſeen by mortals here below, yet he is viſible, and that is enough to conſtitute him the viſible Head of the Catholick viſible Church. There are ſome Kingdoms that never ſee their Prince, and in all Kingdoms, multitudes of Subjects that never lay their eyes on him, and yet he is never the leſs their Civil viſible Head.

But there are ſome men in the world, that will take very ſmall occaſions to ſignifie their diſpleaſure againſt Mr. *B.* and what hath he done to deſerve their laſh? and why muſt he be the Subject of theſe moſt twinging Satyrs? they are the words of a late Author: and what is the ſpleen that he vents againſt the Church of *England*,

land, that makes their choler to ferment and boyl?

'Tis true, Mr. *B.* doth, with a brave and generous courage, rebuke what he thinks amiss in the governours and government of the Church of *England*: he speaks plainly, and without respect of persons; he flatters none, nor fawns upon none, but indifferently reproves whatever he thinks worthy of it, in whomsoever it be. And if this be to vent his spleen against the Church of *England*, I think he hath very venerable patterns and examples for it, both in the Old Testament and the New, as this Learned Dr. very well knows.

If it should be said, that Mr. *B.* reproves where there is no fault, I answer, I should much rejoice if this were true, and I believe so would Mr. *B.* as well as I: but he must shut his eyes against the mid-day light, that thinks there is no fault in the Government of this Church, or nothing worthy of the plainest and most keen reproofs therein. 'Twere very easie to name many things, if a man delighted to rake in Sinks and Kennels, I mean, the proceedings in the Spiritual Courts.

Page 302. The Dr. tells us, that Mr. *B.* had said in his Answer to his Sermon, that he would fain learn of him, what those rules and ties are which make a National Church, whether divine or humane? If it be a divine rule, we (says Mr. *B.*) are of the National Church as well as you; if humane, he enquires how consent in these makes a National Church? and how they come to be of the National Church which do not consent in them? and objects the differences among the Conformable Clergy, in the exposition of some of the Articles of this Church.

To which the Dr. answers three things. I shall take notice only of the last of them, (*viz.*) "There is no difference among us concerning the lawfulness of the orders of our Church, and duty of "submission to them; if there be any other differences, they are "not material, and I believe, are no other than in the manner of "explaining some things which may happen in the best society in "the world, without breaking the peace of it; as about the difference of orders, the sense of some passages in the Athanasian "Creed, the true explication of one or two Articles, which are "the things he (*i. e.* Mr. *B.*) mentions. A multitude of such differences will never overthrow such a consent among us, as to make "us not to be members of the same National Church.

To the first lines of this Paragraph, which concern the agreement of the Members of this Church in the lawfulness of its orders, and the duty of submission to them, I shall reply nothing. To the rest I say, I am perfectly of the Dr's. opinion; and were it reduced to practice, it would heal the most of the divisions, and put a period to most of the separations that have rent and torn this Church in pieces for many years. Why might not the Dissenters among us have been permitted to have continued in the Ministry, and in the Church, though they differed in some things in their judgments from the Conformable Clergy? Would it have broken the peace thereof, any more than the various apprehensions that are at present among themselves? They are not all of a mind in the five points; some of them understand and believe them after the sense of *Calvin*, and others after the sense of *Arminius*; and I might mention many others wherein they differ among themselves, but the thing is sufficiently known, and there is no need of it: And are the differences among the Conformists themselves reconcilable with peace; and those wherein the Nonconformists differ from them (though they be no greater than the other) irreconcilable with it? What strange partiality is this? Conformists may differ in multitudes of things, without breaking the peace of the Church; but if those that are Dissenters, differ from them in a few impertinent and uncertain, things, the peace of the Church is subverted, and all things put into confusion thereby. The Conformists doubt (at least some of them) whether Bishops and Presbyters do differ in *order* or in *degree*, some are past all doubt concerning it, and do affirm they differ in *order* and not barely in *degree*. This breaks no peace. The Nonconformists cannot find that Word of God, whereby 'tis certain that children (indefinitely) which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved: and they are not very sure, that all children that are baptized, are *regenerate by the Spirit*, or that they may safely say of all that they bury, that *God of his great mercy hath taken to himself the soul* of the deceased person, and give him *hearty thanks* that it hath pleased him to *deliver him out of the afflictions of this sinful world*: and these are such dreadful and formidable things, that the Church cannot be safe, if the Members, or at least any of the Preachers in it, dispute the truth of them, and therefore out they must go; and if they attempt to exercise their Ministerial Office after they are ejected, they are immediately the most damnable Schismaticks that ever the

the world did know, and Prisons, Fines, Confiscations, Banishments, and all that is evil, is beneath their sin and transgression.

Why a difference of opinion in these things might not be consistent with peace, as well as in others that are of as great, and somewhat greater import (at least in my apprehension) I am not able to divine; if nothing but Reason and Religion were to determine concerning them: but if spight, malice, and revenge, and some other of those Antichristian passions, be called to counsel, and permitted to judg of them, 'tis not difficult to give a reason of the differing natures of these differences, why some are judged consistent with peace, and others utterly inconsistent with it. But enough of this paragraph. I shall conclude with one supplication to all the Conformable Clergy in *England* on the behalf of the Dissenters; and 'tis this, That they may be permitted to differ from them in things of no greater moment than those in which they differ among themselves. If it be said, 'tis not in their power to permit it: I answer, Time was when it was very much in their power to have done it; and I think they might do well to use some endeavours to retrieve it; or at least give some evidence that they wish well to it. This I think is no unreasonable request; how it may be resented, I know not; 'tis the love of this Church, and the peace thereof, that hath caused me to propose it, and that shall satisfie my mind.

But having said this on the behalf of the Dissenters, I must add a word or two on my own behalf, and that is, That a fair and passable sense may be, and is put upon these passages mentioned from the *Rubrick* and *Liturgy*, by the Conformable Clergy, and amongst them by my self; but what is that to those whose judgments and consciences will not permit them to put that sense upon them? All mens minds are not cast in the same mould; all cannot admit that latitude of sense, and exposition in those and many other things, that some men do and can without offence and neglect to their consciences; and must they therefore be shut out of the Vineyard of the Lord, and denied the liberty of working there? Certainly this is a severe method of proceeding, and hardly reconcilable with the Laws of Christianity.

The Learned Dr. in several places of his Book represents Mr. *A.* as unlearned, unread, and very weak in his reasoning and argumentations. Page 174. *he accuses him of childish trifling about words a Canon*; and in the same page, and that next to it, he mislikes his explication

plication of the words τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν, leaving out κανόνι, which he obſerves from *Grotius* is not found in one Manuſcript, the ſenſe whereof he thus expreſſes; *What we have attained, let us walk up to the ſame*; and that *Greek* phraſe τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, which he ſays *implies no more than minding that very thing, viz.* v. 14. *preſſing towards the mark:* and then adds; *But if he had pleaſed to have read on to* Phil. 4. 2. *he would have found* τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν *to ſignifie unanimity; and St.* Paul, 1 Cor. 12. 25. *oppoſes the* τὸ αὐτὸ *to* σχίσμα, *that there be no ſchiſm in the body, but that all the members ſhould take care of* τὸ αὐτὸ *one for another; and therefore the* τὸ αὐτο φρονεῖν *is very aptly uſed againſt ſchiſms and diviſions:* and adds, *I ſhould think that* St. Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, *and* Theophilact, *all underſtood the importance of a* Greek *phraſe, as well as our Author, and they all make no ſcruple to interpret it of the peace and concord of Chriſtians. And although* Auſtin *did not underſtand much* Greek, *yet he knew the general ſenſe of the Chriſtian Church about this place, and he particularly applies it to the peace of the Church in St* Cyprian's *caſe.* "By this taſt now (ſays the Dr.) let any man judg of the depth of "this man's Learning, or rather the height of his confidence, who "dares to tell the world, that the Univerſal ſtream and current of "all Expoſitors is againſt my ſenſe of this Text; and for this uni-"verſal ſtream (beſides *Grotius*) who ſpeaks exactly to the ſame "ſenſe with mine, quotes only *Tirinus* and *Zanchy*, and then cries, "in a word they all conſpire againſt my interpretation. And within a few lines he adds, "But had it not been fairer dealing, in one "word to have referred us to Mr. *Pool*'s *Synopſis*; for if he had "looked into *Zanchy* himſelf, he would have found how ſharply he "applied it againſt Diſſenters in the Church.

And in p. 203. after he had made him Advocate-General for Schiſmaticks, by an Oration put into his mouth, and pronounced before St. *Auſtin, Cyprian*, and other great oppoſers of Schiſm, thus he ſpeaks, *Judg now, Reader, whether the Cauſes of the preſent Separation, as they are laid down by my Adverſary, do not equally defend the* Donatiſts *in their Schiſm; and his making ſo light of Schiſm, doth not give encouragement to men to make more. But I ſhall not ſend him ſo far back as* Auſtin *and* Cyprian *for better inſtruction in this matter; but I ſhall ſend him to one whoſe Writings he is better acquainted with, even Mr.* Baxter.

And in page 304 the Dr. compares him with *Andrelinus*, of whom *Eraſmus* ſays, "That he was a good Poet, but his Verſes

wanted

" wanted one syllable, and that was νοῦς in *English* brains; and this because Mr. *A.* had said, *That National Churches destroy the being of other Churches under them; which* (says the Dr.) *I utterly deny; and there wants nothing but proof.*

To all this I shall reply as followeth: If Mr. *A.* do intermix any pleasantness in his discourse, 'tis presently condemned as trifling, and he compared with Carmen and Porters. If he give his Readers any divertisement, by intermingling some Wit and Fancy with his Reasonings, he is scurrilous, and compared to *Martin* (an Author I confess that I never had the misfortune to read; but he is sufficiently famed for railing). If he intersperse a little saltness among his Ratiocinations, he is ungentile, and a Buffoon, which is the Title wherewith a Gentleman hath lately graced him in a Reply to his Book. What shall Mr. *A.* do in this case? and how shall he please these Gentlemen? Would they have him turn fool to humour them, and lay aside his Wit (which makes his Writings the more savoury and grateful) to do them a pleasure? I do not find that those that have replied to him, have laid any obligation upon him to do them such a kindness; and I think he will be loath to purchase their favour and good will at so dear a rate.

But Mr. *A.* hath interpreted the *Greek* Phrases, before mentioned, otherwise than *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Theoplylact*, and St. *Austin*: and what then! is he the only person that hath interpreted Texts of Scripture, contrary to the opinion and judgments of those Fathers? do not all Expositors almost do the same? do not the Papists (though otherwise obliged by the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*) do it? does not the admired *Hugo Grotius* do it? and I dare say, this excellent Dr. himself understands very many Texts of Scripture in other senses than the ancient Fathers did expound them. Whether Mr *A.* have rightly interpreted the Texts in Controversie, I will not determine; but this I will say, he may be a Learned man, though he may have expounded them otherwise than St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Theodoret*, &c.

Whether the universal current of all Expositors be against the Dr's sense of his Text, as Mr. *A.* affirms, I know not (for my Library is not furnished with all the Commentators in the world) nor will I say, that Mr. *A.* did look into *lanchy* himself, and not transcribe what he quotes from Mr. *Pooles Synopsis*; but this I think I may say, that I see no convincing evidence that Mr. *A.* did not peruse that Author himself, and transcribe the words from him

him, and not from Mr. *Pool*; and therefore I humbly conceive the Dr. hath affirmed, or at leaſt inſinuated more than he hath proved, *viz.* that Mr. *A*'s quotations are tranſcribed from the *Synopſis Criticorum*, and not from the Authors themſelves. But if Mr. *A.* muſt be a Pigmy in Learning, what honour is it then for the very great and learned Dr. to beat and overcome him?

Let it be granted therefore for once, that Mr. *A.* is not the moſt learned or beſt-read man in the world, and that there are ſome, yea many that have learned and read much more than he; but what then? he may be a Maſter of Reaſon, and a man of ſome tolerable judgment, notwithſtanding thoſe defects (or elſe many great men, and ſome that are in great reputation for wiſdom, muſt be numbred among Dolts, and ſit in the Claſſis of Fools) he may be able to underſtand the ſenſe of a Text of Scripture, and the dependance and connexion of it with the precedent and conſequent Verſes, and the ſcope and deſign of the Author therein. Theſe things may be done by men of competent underſtanding (and I think that will be granted to Mr. *A.*) though they never read all the Books in the *Bodleian* Library, or in ſome that are more meanly furniſhed; and 'tis ſome mens opinion, that the greateſt Readers are not always the moſt judicious men; and that if ſome very worthy men had read leſs, they might have underſtood more. Hence I think I may infer, that though Mr. *A.* ſhould not have read St. *Chryſoſtome*, *&c.* nor many modern Commentators, yet he may be capable of expounding a Text of Scripture with the probability of truth, as well as thoſe that have read them all.

And whereas it hath pleaſed the Learned Dr. to entitle him Advocate-General for Schiſmaticks, I am not ſatisfied that Mr. *A.* hath given any juſt reaſon for it. 'Tis true he hath ſaid, that ſome little and petty inconveniences ariſing from the levity and volubility of mens minds, is more eligible than the enſlaving mens judgments and conſciences, and ſurrendring their reaſon to naked will and pleaſure, even as 'tis better to have a rational ſoul, though ſubject to miſtakes, than the ſoul of a brute which may be managed with a ſtrong bit and bridle, as you pleaſe. This is the ſenſe of Mr. *A*'s words in his Preface; and what hurt is there in them? Do not all Proteſtants ſpeak the ſame language? And is it not better that men err in ſome things, than that they put out their eyes, and ſee with thoſe of other men, blindly following their conduct, and ſubmitting and aſſenting to all their Impoſitions?

But

But the Dr. will ſay, Is Separation by reaſon of the levity of mens minds only, a ſmall or petty inconvenience? In anſwer whereunto, I would diſtinguiſh of Separation. There is a Separation that proceeds upon reaſons apparently true, and ſuch is the Separation of Proteſtants from the Church of *Rome*; and this is a great and neceſſary duty: There is a Separation that proceeds upon probable reaſons, which ſometimes are not cogent nor concluſive, and yet they may be ſuch as honeſt and upright minded men may not be able to free themſelves from being entangled and fettered by them. This is an inconvenience, and whether it be great or ſmall, I know not how 'twill be avoided in this ſtate of weakneſs and imperfection, but by remedies worſe than the diſeaſe. But that which to my apprehenſion ſeems the beſt way of avoiding it is, Let nothing be made neceſſary to Communion in Churches, but a few plain neceſſary things, and this would certainly put an end to the moſt of thoſe Diviſions and Separations that have, and do vex the Chriſtian Churches, and the Church of *England* eſpecially and particularly: But there is a Separation that proceeds upon reaſons apparently falſe; ſuch is the Separation of the *Socinians* from the Reformed Churches, and ſuch is the Separation of many in the Church of *England*. This is intollerable, and by all prudent and Chriſtian means and endeavours to be repreſſed. By Separation here, I mean not barely refuſing *Communion*, but ſetting up new Churches in oppoſition to thoſe they have forſaken.

But it may be enquired further, Whether Separation upon probable, weak, and unconcluding reaſons, be not ſinful? I anſwer, Yes: but what if it be? there is ſome difference in ſins, as moſt men believe, and I ſee no great reaſon to doubt of it; and 'tis my opinion, that neither all Sinners, nor all Schiſmaticks, that are truly ſuch, muſt be ſent to the Mines, or to the Galleys. In brief, God will make a difference between Sinners at the day of Judgment; and I do believe, that the Governours of Churches, both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, ſhould make ſome difference between them here. In the mean time, I would not be thought either to excuſe, or encourage unjuſtifiable Separations. I would that the ſinfulneſs of ſuch Separation ſhould be laid open with all its juſt aggravations, and that all juſt means be uſed by the Miniſters of the Goſpel, to prevent and hinder it, yea, and ſomething by the Magiſtrate too; but if Separation cannot be prevented (I mean ſuch as proceeds upon *probable*, but not *concluding* reaſons) by thoſe endeavours, it

must be endured, an inconvenience being more eligible than a miſchief; and many things are, and muſt be ſuffered in all ſocieties, that are not, nor ought not to be approved. Such was divorce in the *Jewiſh* Commonwealth, and ſome things elſe in that, and other ſocieties of men.

If it be ſaid, that the Church of *England* doth not impoſe any thing upon its members by meer authority, as the Church of *Rome* doth, nor doth it force them to reſign their reaſon to naked will and pleaſure, nor command belief of thoſe notorious falſhoods which that imperious and Apoſtate Synagogue of Satan doth. I anſwer, 'tis readily granted (and we bleſs God for it), that this Church doth impoſe nothing that is apparently and groſly falſe; it commands no Idolatrous Worſhip, no opinions contrary to the common ſenſe of mankind, no invocation of Saints, Prayers for the dead, no Pilgrimages to Shrines, no ridiculous or ſottiſh Superſtitions: but though it impoſe nothing groſly falſe, fooliſh or Superſtitious, yet ſome men think (and I know not how to confute them), that it impoſes ſome things dubious, uncertain, and unneceſſary, from which the Clergy cannot diſſent, but thereby they ſhut themſelves out of their office, and become uncapable of exerciſing their Miniſtry with the countenance and protection of the Laws. And if the Laity doubt the truth of any of its Impoſitions, and do publiſh their doubts, and will be pertinacious in the defence of them, they are liable to excommunication, and all that is conſequent unto it: and in theſe things this Church is peremptory, and admits of no indulgence; Subſcribe, or Preach not the Goſpel; ſpeak nothing to the diſparagement of any thing in the Doctrine, Diſcipline, or Liturgy, or you ſhall be excommunicated, and given up to the Devil. Thus it ſpeaks, and this is its Language.

I do eaſily grant, that this Church pretends not to Infallibility, as the Church of *Rome* doth; but in whatſoever it determines, it avows it ſelf not miſtaken or deceived: And what is the difference in effect, between a Church that aſſumes to it ſelf the title and approbation of Infallible, and a Church that ſays, I am not miſtaken in my Determinations and Impoſitions? Suppoſe two perſons, one a *Neſtorian*, the other an *Eutichian*; the one propoſes in certain Articles, his Doctrine, ſo as confounds Chriſts *Natures*, and withal tells you, he is Infallible, and you muſt ſubſcribe to, and acknowledg the truth of it, or prepare your ſelf for the Axe or the Gallows: the other propoſes his Doctrine, ſo as he

divides

divides Christs *Person*, but pretends not to be Infallible, but says, his Doctrine is true, and he is not mistaken in it, and 'tis at your pleasure, and in your choice either to subscribe it, or prepare your self for the Mines of *Peru* and the *Indies*. The Application is obvious, and every one can make it without my manuduction, or direction.

But let me not be said to defame this Church. I have said already, that it imposes nothing grosly and apparently false, but only some things unnecessary, and uncertain. I will add here, the penalties imposed upon those that refuse to own, and acknowledg, or do defame its determinations, are not so severe, nor sanguinary, as in the *Roman* Church, nor peradventure so certainly and severely executed, but whether the peremptory imposing things doubtful, controverted, useless, and unnecessary, upon the legal and established penalties, be not tyrannical and imperious, would deserve a little consideration. Why must all Ministers be obliged to subscribe to all things in the 39. Articles, Liturgy, and Book of Ordination, as containing nothing contrary to the Word of God? Why must they subscribe the 20*th* Article, concerniug the power of the Church to ordain Rites and Ceremonies? Why must they assent to the 8*th* Article, where 'tis said, that the *Athanasian* Creed ought throughly to be received and believed? why must the salvation of Infants being baptized, and dying before the commission of actual sin, be acknowledged as certain by the Word of God? and why must they assent to, and subscribe the lawfulness of the use of the Cross in Baptism, with more that might be mentioned? Are these things certain, and so clear and obvious, that an honest man can't doubt of them? Are these things necessary? Cannot a man be a Minister, or a Christian that doth not, nor cannot believe them? This cannot, or at least ought not to be imagined or affirmed; why then doth the Church of *England* require Ministers to subscribe unto them? and why must none of the Laity dispute the truth of them? What reason can be alledged for it, but its own good will and pleasure? I know no other that can be given of it, thither it must be referred at last. And whether this be not to exercise an Empire over the judgments and consciences of men, and to command the surrender of their reason to naked will and pleasure, I leave to consideration. It hath the likeness and appear-

ance of it; and how the Church of *England* will fairly free themſelves of it, I do not yet diſcern; I would be glad to ſee it done; for the exerciſe of Empire over the conſciences of men in uncertain and unneceſſary things, is a very evil and miſchievous thing, an Engine of the Devil, by which I do believe he hath done more miſchief in the Church of God, than by all the Heathen perſecutions; and I know no end is ſerved by it, unleſs it be to choak conſcientious men; for all men of conſcience are not Latitudinarians, nor like to be in my apprehenſion.

The ſum of what I have ſaid in theſe three laſt Paragraphs, is this; Mr. *A.* hath ſaid, ſome little and petty inconveniencies ariſing from the levity and inconſtancy of mens minds, is more eligible than the proſtituting mens conſciences, and reſigning them to the naked wills of men, which is no more than moſt Proteſtants have ſaid before him.

Separations are various; ſome proceed upon reaſons apparently true, and theſe are a neceſſary duty; ſome proceed upon reaſons apparently falſe, and theſe are greatly ſinful and intollerable; others proceed upon probable reaſons, which though ſpecious and fair, yet are not concluding, theſe are not without ſin, yet muſt be endured, an inconvenience being better than a miſchief: And this, I conceive is the ſeparation which the Dr. ſays Mr. *A.* makes very light of, which yet I do not believe, unleſs it be comparatively, and for the ſake of which I do not think him worthy of the appellation of Advocate-general for Schiſmaticks.

The Church of *England* doth not pretend to be infallible, but is as peremptory in its determinations as if it were. It impoſes nothing groſly falſe, and againſt common ſenſe and reaſon, but it requires things unneceſſary and uncertain, with an unyielding rigour, and this looks like tyranny; and if the Church of *England* think it ſelf defamed by that inſinuation, it may vindicate it ſelf if it can.

To the Drs. inſinuation, that Mr. *A* is not much acquainted in the Writings of *Cyprian* and St. *Auſtin*, and that he hath been more converſant in thoſe of Mr. *B.* I might enquire where is the Proof? and what evidence doth this Learned man produce for the confirmation of it? I have looked his Book all over, but I can find none, nor do I imagine what

hath

hath given occaſion to the Dr. to think ſo: 'tis true Mr. *A.* doth not quote thoſe Fathers in his Book; but doth it follow from thence, that he never read them? There are many Books which the Excellent Dr. himſelf hath never quoted in any of his writings; but he that ſhould infer from thence, that he never read them, would certainly injure and traduce him. But Mr. *A.* is a Diſſenter, and peradventure for that reaſon muſt be an unlearned and unread man, whoſe reaſon muſt be as weak therefore as his reading is ſmall, and there muſt be no more argument in his diſcourſe, than there was of Wit or Brains in *Andrelinus* his Poems; which, to ſpeak modeſtly, is a ſcurrilous compariſon, and not becoming the Pen of the Reverend Dr.

Mr. *B.* had ſaid ſomething in his Anſwer to the Drs. Sermon, of the Peoples Power, or right of chooſing, or at leaſt conſenting to the choice of their own Paſtors; whereupon he ſays, that *Mr.* B. *is very tragical upon this argument, and keeps not within tollerable bounds of diſcretion, in pleading the Peoples Right or Cauſe againſt Magiſtrates, Patrons and Laws*, p. 307. And p. 329. he ſays, *Mr.* B. *is unſatisfied with any Laws that are made in this matter*: and in the ſame page he ſays, *that one would think by Mr.* B's *Doctrine, all Laws about Patronage are void in themſelves; and all Rights of Advouſon in the King, Noblemen, Gentlemen, and the Univerſities, are meer uſurpations, and things utterly unlawful among Chriſtians, ſince he makes ſuch a perſonal obligation to chooſe their own Paſtors, to lie on the People, that they cannot transfer it by their own Act.*

To which I reply, Mr. *B.* will be well enough ſatisfied, if the People may have the liberty of conſenting to the Paſtor that by the Patron is preſented to them; and what is there of unreaſonableneſs in ſuch a deſign or propoſal? Bleſſed be God there are in *England* many worthy Gentlemen that take care of the diſpoſal of their Livings, and preſent ſober and learned men unto them; and in my obſervation, ſuch perſons are uſually acceptable to the People, and they conſent to them without objection or oppoſition; but then it muſt be acknowledged, that there are many others that take no care of the diſpoſal of them, ſome are Papiſts, and give their Livings to the nomination of their Servants, and they ſell them to whomſoever will give moſt for them; others are prophane Senſualiſts, and ſuch men will preſent vitious, debauched perſons. Piety and a ſober Converſation may preclude, but

but will never commend a man to their preſentation. And what if for theſe reaſons, and more that might be mentioned, the people had a conſenting power permitted to them? are the Rights of Patronage invaded or abdicated, injured or deſtroyed thereby? Hath not the Biſhop power in ſome caſes to refuſe the Clerk that is preſented to him for inſtitution? and is the Patrons right evacuated by it? Surely no, I never heard any ſuch thing affirmed, or pretended; and if the Patrons right may be preſerved with a power of juſt and reaſonable diſſent and conſent in the Biſhop, it may be alſo preſerved with the ſame power in the people: Are not Patrons right preſerved, unleſs they may impoſe upon the people ignorant and ſcandalous Miniſters, that are neither able nor willing to Preach the Doctrines of Faith and Godlineſs? are not their rights preſerved unleſs they have the liberty of preſenting whom they liſt, and ſending them ſuch Preachers, as inſtead of being enſamples to the flock in Piety, Juſtice, Charity, and Sobriety, ſhall be enſamples of Impiety, Cruelty, Injuſtice, and Intemperance unto them?

If it ſhould be ſaid, that ſuch cannot procure Orders, nor Inſtitution from the Dioceſan: I anſwer, 'tis in vain to diſpute againſt ſenſe and experience; and men will never believe that cannot be done which they ſee done before their eyes; and the Biſhops are cheated by Certificates and Teſtimonials, for there are few men ſo bad, that cannot find others as bad as themſelves, to vouch for them.

And if this liberty were granted to the people, I am not apprehenſive of thoſe evil conſequences that the Dr. ſeems to fear, who tells us, *Where a Pariſh is divided in their opinions about Religion (as we know too many are at this day) all the ſeveral parties,* Anabaptiſts, Quakers, *yea and* Papiſts, *as well as others, will put in for a ſhare in what concerns their ſouls, and conſequently chuſe a Paſtor each party to themſelves, and the Incumbent that is legally intitled to the profits of the Living, may poſſeſs them, and the people may follow the conduct of other Guides, even ſuch as themſelves have choſen.*

For I would propoſe that this Liberty might be legally granted to the people, and that their conſent and diſſent ſhould be limited by juſt Rules, and upon equitable Reaſons, and that our Superiors might ſuperintend them in the exerciſe of it, and ſee that they do not abuſe it. For ſurely there is ſome difference between the uſe of Power, Liberty, and Privilege, and the abuſe of it; and one may be

be reſtrained, without taking away the other. The abuſe of the peoples liberty in the choice of a *Quaker* or *Socinian*, or a *Papiſt* for their Teacher, may be reſtrained without depriving them of the liberty of refuſing a wicked, ſcandalous, ignorant wretch, or chuſing an honeſt, pious, learned, and ſober man. Cannot the Learned Dr. reſtrain his Daughter from chuſing a prophane Senſualiſt (whoſe God is his belly, and hath nothing brave or generous in his ſoul) or her Husband, without depriving her of the liberty of chuſing an honeſt, worthy, brave, and virtuous man? And this I think is all that Mr. *B.* deſires, at leaſt this would ſatisfie him; and I know not why the Learned Dr. repreſents this opinion or deſire of Mr. *B.* in ſo monſtrous and odious a manner, unleſs it be to make him an offence to Noblemen, Gentlemen, Univerſities, and all ſuch as have right of Patronage belonging to them.

Page 371. *The Author of the Letter out of the Countrey* (ſays the Dr.) *lays the foundation of the Separation upon the force of ſcruples, mighty ſcruples, ſcruples of a long ſtanding, and of a large extent; ſcruples that there is no hopes to remove, without ſome very overpowering impreſſions on mens minds.* To which the Dr. replies, *I am ſo much of another mind, that I think a little impartiality, and due conſideration, would do the buſineſs.*

I cannot be ſo uncharitable as to believe, that none of the Diſſenters do impartially conſider the things in controverſie between them and the Church of *England*, and which are the grounds of the preſent Separation, when they do ſolemnly profeſs the contrary, with appeals to God who ſearcheth the hearts, and trieth the reins; and 'tis ſevere to give them the lye in ſuch a caſe, where 'tis certain we are no competent or capable judges. But ſuppoſe they (at leaſt ſome of them) ſhould not impartially conſider (and 'tis no eaſie matter either for Conſenters or Diſſenters to lay aſide all partiality) what will be inferred from thence? Muſt they not be endured upon the earth? Are they inſufferable in the Land? If all were baniſhed, impriſoned, or hanged, that are guilty of no greater ſins than a little partiality in conſideration, there would be few *Conformiſts* or *Nonconformiſts* left in this Nation. But peradventure it may be no great fault to be partial in the conſideration of other things, when to be partial in conſidering the grounds and reaſons of the preſent Separation, is an unpardonable ſin, and not to be forgiven

given in this world, whatever it may be in the world to come.

Though the Dr. seems to think it a thing of no great difficulty to cure mens scruples, in the words above-mentioned, and in some others in the following page; yet he speaks to a contrary sense, p. 48. of his Preface, where he tells us of *the almost invincible ignorance of some weaker people, and the uncurable biass of some mens minds.* Is the almost invincible ignorance of weak people easily removed? yes, saith the Dr. *Honest men may be cured of their errors and mistakes.* But how is it to be done? *why, by bringing them to a better temper, and to more judgment*, p. 372. I thought so; but how shall we do that? Are the almost invincibly ignorant, made judicious upon easie endeavours? And are those that have incurable byasses upon their minds, brought to a better temper of mind with a wet finger? I know not what the Drs. experience is, but I am sure 'tis otherwise in mine, and in many others. I find it impossible to remove the ignorance, and take off the prejudices and byasses of some peoples minds, humanely speaking, as the phrase now is; and the reason is obvious, I can bring them light, but I cannot give them eyes. I can propound reason and evidence sufficient, as I think, to remove their fears, scruples, and prejudices; but I cannot give them understandings to apprehend and perceive the cogency, weight and sufficiency thereof. Mens understandings are of as many differing degrees and sizes, as their faces are of differing shapes and features; and what one man can perceive and understand, another cannot do. One man can see the smallest needles or hairs, another cannot see them, though it were to save his life. Besides, there are peculiarities in the understandings of men; how they came there, I will neither enquire nor determine; but that there are such things, cannot be denied. The Doctrine of *Calvin* in the five points, to some men seems utterly irrational, and contrary to the common sentiments of mankind, and all that they read and hear for the alteration of their apprehensions, makes no impression or change upon them. Others there are that have the same apprehensions of the Doctrine of *Arminius* in those points; and the like I might say of many other Controversies in Religion. Mens minds seem inclined to embrace one part of the Controversie, by a peculiarity of frame, temper, and disposition; and in this case 'tis a mighty difficulty to prevail with such men to alter their apprehensions, if not impossible. Which things being premised, and certain, I think not those words of Mr. *B.* so severe as the Dr. seems to imagine them, *viz.*

That

That *he that thinks his own or others Reasonings will ever change all the truly honest Christians in the Land (as to the unlawfulness of the things imposed) knoweth so little of matters, or of men, or of conscience, that he is unmeet to be a Bishop or Priest:* for is not he fit for that Office, or those Employments, that doth not know, that the measures and degrees of mens understandings are almost infinite; and that they will never agree, unless it be in a few plain, great, and necessary things, and that in multitudes of lesser things they will differ for ever; and that in this diversity of understandings 'tis impossible it should be otherwise; and that under this diversity of apprehensions, there will be some diversity of practises too, where men fear God, and have a value for their own Consciences, and the suggestions thereof? is he fit to bear the Office of a Bishop, or a Priest, that is ignorant of these things? surely he is very little acquainted in the great variety and imperfections of humane minds, that thinks, that all Christians will ever be of one mind in many lesser things: and he is as little acquainted with the Consciences of men, that thinks honest Christians will be of the same practice, where their judgments are so much divided. I will conclude this Paragraph with the following Story, which will serve to evince the incurableness of some peoples jealousies and scruples; and I'le do it in the words of the person that sent it to me. *I know a Gentlewoman whose Parents were of the Congregational persuasion, and such was her education; nevertheless after her marriage (her husband being conformable) she accompanied him to the publick worship of God, and this she did for some years; but all this time her scruples, and her fears, and the jealousies of her Conscience did so plague and torment her, that she had little or no comfort in her life, yea, her bodily health was very much weakned, and impaired by the perturbations of her mind: this having been her condition for some years, at length she forsook the publick and established worship, betook her self to a Congregational Church, and now lives in peace, and tollerable health. The Gentlewoman, I do believe, is truly pious and conscientious, and doth avow, that could she be satisfied of the lawfulness of attending on the publick way of worship, she would do it with all her heart. Her reason and arguments may be easily answered, and she may be silenced, and, one would think, her judgment satisfied; but her scruples return again like a Torrent, and she cannot resist them;*

and, in plain Engliſh, *are incurable, without ſome very great and transforming impreſſions from above. And this is no rare or ſingle caſe, but what often occurs, as thoſe men know that converſe with the conſciences of Chriſtians.*

The Dr. returns again to the Author of the Letter out of the Countrey, *pag.* 376. and thus he ſpeaks concerning him, *The main force of what he ſaith* (i. e. *the Author of that Letter*) *lyes in this, that thoſe that cannot conquer their ſcruples as to Communion with our Church, muſt either return to the ſtate of Paganiſm, or ſet up new Churches, by joining with the ejected Miniſters.* To which the Dr. replies, *This is new Doctrine, and never heard of in the days of the old Puritans; for they ſuppoſed men obliged to continue in the communion of this Church, although there were ſome things they ſcrupled, and could not conquer thoſe ſcruples; and this they ſuppoſed to be far enough from Paganiſm.*

The old Puritans did ſuppoſe, that thoſe that ſcrupled *Miniſterial* communion, were obliged to continue as Lay-men in the communion of this Church: But what is this to thoſe that ſcruple *Lay*-communion, which is the caſe of many now in *England?* And what ſhall theſe people do? they muſt either communicate againſt their Conſciences, or joyn with the ejected Miniſters, or live as *Pagans*; and which it is the Dr. will adviſe them to, I cannot tell; but 'tis poſſible we may know hereafter. If he ſhould ſay, they muſt put off their ſcruples, and communicate with the licenſe and approbation of their conſciences; I ſay ſo too. 'Tis their duty to endeavour it: but what if after all the endeavours they can uſe, they cannot diſentangle their minds from them, what ſhall they do then? I beſeech the Learned Dr. to give ſome directions to theſe ſcrupulous perſons in this caſe.

In the ſame Page the Dr. deſires to know, *whether as often as men do ſcruple joyning with others, their ſeparation be lawful?*

And

And I do desire to know, whether all unlawful separation be intollerable? and whether all Schismaticks, that are truly so, must be imprisoned, ruined and undone, or sent to *Caucasus*, and the *Caspian* Mountains? When the Dr. hath answered this enquiry, peradventure he may receive an Answer to the other, if he cannot answer it himself.

The D. adds in the same, and the following Page, *If it be lawful to separate as often as men scruple the lawfulness of joyning in communion with our Church, 'tis in vain to talk of any setled Constitution, whether Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent; for this Principle overthrows them all.*

To which I answer, I do not think it lawful to separate as often as men scruple joyning in communion; yet I do believe it lawful to tolerate some unlawful separations, yea and necessary too; but let no unnecessary occasions of scruple and separation be given. Let no separations for the sake of undoubted truths, and the great essentials of Faith and Godliness be allowed. Let the Congregations in the Nation be furnished with pious and holy Ministers, and some discipline exercised in them, and 'twill be found that the number of Separatists will not be great, and a stop will be put to the progress and encrease of them, and a few years will reduce them almost to none: for if the Causes of Separation be looked into, they will be found to be the imposing and requiring of unnecessary and doubtful things, ignorant and scandalous Preachers, and undisciplined Churches. Whether these things will *justifie* it, I will not say; but that they are the main *Causes* of it, cannot be denied by any considering man. And if these be not removed, Separation will be continued, unless the Popish method of Cure be undertaken, (*viz.*) Fire and Faggot, Racks and Tortures, Confiscations and Punishments, which certainly are Remedies that were never taught by Christ Jesus, the Lover and Saviour of mankind; but by the Devil, the great enemy, hater and destroyer of them.

And let me add further, that I see no reason to infer, that toleration of Separation upon tolerable scruples, will destroy all Government in the Church: for I think there was a Government in the Church, when the *Novatians* were tolerated both at *Rome* and *Constantinople* for some hundreds of years, as the Doctor very well knows; and I hope we have a Government in the Nation, though some men transgress the established Laws thereof, yea and are permitted so to do with impunity. Yet I would distinguish between Separation in the bud and blossome, and Separation ripe and grown, as 'tis with us in *England*; and I would say, that some things may be done, and some severities used to crush and prevent the encrease of it when budding; which may not be done to extinguish and root it out when its grown and encreased, and the number of those that separate, is very great and numerous. Some few single Schismaticks (not that are made such by unnecessary Impositions, but such as make themselves such by unreasonable and unwarrantable scruples and objections) may after the use of admonition, teaching, and instruction, and a patient waiting for the success of them, be treated with some rigor and moderate harshness. But thousands and ten thousands are too many either to be laid in Gaols, or sent to the barren deserts of *Arabia*, or other Countreys at lesser distance from us.

Page 378. The Learned Dr. wonders that *none of those who have undertaken to defend the cause of Separation, have taken any care to put stop to it, or to let us know where we may fix and see an end of it: which scruples are to be allowed, and what not; and whether it be lawful to separate, as long as men can go on in scruples, and say they cannot conquer them?*

Mr. *B* I suppose, is one of them which the Doctor believes hath undertaken to defend the cause of Separation; and I wonder the Doctor should not observe that he hath taken care to put a stop to it, and let us know what scruples are to be allowed, and what not. Hath he not said over and over, even

even to times without number, That a difference is to be made betwixt *tolerable* and *intolerable* ſcruples and errors; betwixt ſcruples that may be defended by probable reaſons, and ſuch as have nothing to be pleaded on their behalf, but apparent and obvious falſhoods; betwixt ſcruples about unneceſſary and diſputable things, and ſuch as are about neceſſary and undoubted truths, and ſo owned and confeſſed by all Chriſtians? and in ſaying this, he hath told us what ſcruples are to be allowed, and what not; and where to put a ſtop to Separation. 'Tis true, theſe are but general rules to direct us by, in judging of allowable and unallowable errors and ſcruples, and where and when to put a ſtop to Separations; but the application of them to particular caſes, is not difficult; and ſince errors and ſcruples are infinite, I hope the Dr. will not, nor doth not expect that Mr. *Baxter* ſhould name all particularly that are tolerable and intolerable; this were to ſet him an Employment that might laſt to the worlds end, if he could live ſo long, and would prevent his writing of Books to the offence of his Conformable brethren; but, I think, would pleaſe many of them very well, who are willing to be rid of him and his Books.

But Sir, I have, in obedience to your commands, put my Sickle too far into other mens Harveſts; and therefore will here put a period to my *Remarks*. Beſides, I hear Mr. *B.* hath replied to the Learned Dr. and that his Book is abroad in the world, though I have not ſeen it as yet, living, as you know, at a great diſtance, and in a ſmall Village that hath little commerce with *London*. I know you will pardon all the faults and imperfections of theſe haſty Lines; and when you have read them, do what you pleaſe with them. I am,

SIR,

Your very true Friend

and Servant,